



City of Hampton, VA

Meeting Minutes

City Council

22 Lincoln Street
Hampton, VA 23669
www.hampton.gov

Linda Curtis
W. H. "Billy" Hobbs, Jr.
Will Moffett
Chris Snead
Christopher G. Stuart
Donnie R. Tuck
George E. Wallace, Mayor

Staff:
Mary Bunting, City Manager
Jeff Sachs, Interim City Attorney
Katherine K. Glass, CMC, Clerk of Council

| | | |
|-----------------------------|----------|--|
| Wednesday, January 22, 2014 | 12:59 PM | Council Chambers, 8th Floor, City Hall |
|-----------------------------|----------|--|

CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

GEORGE E. WALLACE PRESIDED

PRESENT: Linda Curtis, W. H. "Billy" Hobbs, Jr., Will Moffett, Chris Snead, Christopher G. Stuart, Donnie R. Tuck

AGENDA

1. 14-0049 Update on Committee Work to Identify Best Ways to Recognize Dr. Martin Luther King and Hampton Civil Rights Heroes

City Manager Mary Bunting stated that a group of citizens has been working over several years to look at a variety of options to best recognize Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. and his impact on the Nation and individual citizens. When the committee was first convened, it was Council's desire to also find a way to honor Hamptonians who have carried on the principles and philosophies of Dr. King in their work in the community over the years, as a living legacy to Dr. King. She stated that the group will present several ideas that are acceptable, but there is no "right" idea and the decision is ultimately Council's. She introduced Ms. Michele Woods-Jones, Executive Director of the Citizens' Unity Commission (CUC), who would be leading the presentation. A copy of the presentation is attached to these minutes.

Ms. Woods-Jones stated that she has worked with this committee since the end of 2012, but the group has been working on this assignment since 2010. The committee was convened to discuss three primary areas, a visible recognition of local and National individuals of historical importance in the City of Hampton, criteria to determine qualifications, and conceptual designs of such recognition. They were also tasked with exploring methods for funding.

Ms. Woods-Jones stated that the members represented a wide cross-section of citizens throughout the community. She shared a list of those involved over the years. The group was divided into four working groups: concepts, location, resources, and research. The group decided to approach a dual track, honoring Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. and local

citizens. It was important to the group that both these things happen. She shared the criteria for local recognition. She emphasized that the person should not be recognized for athletics alone, but for contributions in addition to or other than athletics.

Councilman Stuart noted that there is a statue of Arthur Ashe in Richmond, and that there are those in our community who fit the criteria, such as Boo Williams. He asked Ms. Woods-Jones to further explain the athletics criteria. She stated that Boo Williams not only was an outstanding athlete, he has been an extraordinary citizen, serving on the first Blue Ribbon committee of the Ad-Hoc Leadership group and a variety of service organizations throughout the City helping youth. The committee felt it was important to not just look at someone's athletic ability, but what they had done as a result of that ability to contribute to the community. Ms. Bunting noted that the City also has an Athletic Hall of Fame for individuals who have proven themselves in athletic realms, both at the amateur and professional levels. She stated that she believes the spirit of this project was to honor the legacy of Dr. King, so there would need to be more than just athletic ability. Councilman Stuart summarized that an accomplished athlete would be acceptable, if there were other contributions to the City.

Ms. Woods-Jones noted that the group identified approximately 140 potential honorees for consideration.

Ms. Woods-Jones shared the results of a group survey for the location and type of memorial desired. The top result was a fountain or water feature located downtown. Councilman Stuart noted that naming a street is a very traditional thing in municipalities and he was surprised this was not a choice with more support. He stated that he believes Hampton is one of the only, if not the only, Hampton Roads locality without at least an honorary street named after Dr. King. He asked why this choice did not garner more support. Ms. Woods-Jones stated that she believes that they felt Hampton has always been extraordinary and that it is easy to name a street. There are other special ways they wanted Hampton, one of the first cities that mirrored much of what Dr. King stood for, to commemorate him. She noted that there was discussion about doing a street in addition to something else. Councilman Stuart asked if there was more support when the street was discussed as a complement to another project. Ms. Woods-Jones stated that there was more excitement. Councilman Stuart stated that this meant the survey numbers were slightly skewed. Ms. Woods-Jones stated that she doesn't believe the numbers are that skewed because there is a final vote that shows different numbers later in the presentation.

Councilman Moffett stated for the record, although people believe there is not a street in the City named after Dr. King that is not quite accurate. There is a Dr. Martin Luther King Boulevard that runs into Emancipation Drive at Hampton University and the Veteran Affairs hospital. He stated that while this may not be what people traditionally expect, he just wants to ensure accuracy. Ms. Wood-Jones stated that she believes many people see this road in that area, as well as a building named after Dr. King at Hampton University. The desire is to have something downtown, where visitors could readily see it.

Ms. Woods-Jones stated that attendance at the meetings was sporadic, and waned by the time the final meetings were taking place. She stated that she believed this was because the body had been meeting for so long. This provides a challenge in presenting survey results.

Ms. Woods-Jones shared some work of the group. She noted that there was a recommendation for a statue in Downtown Hampton. This was considered for the FY14 budget, but given budget constraints, the Council asked the committee to reconsider the recommendation. The committee also considered proposing a small pocket park that would be adjacent to the new courthouse with a water design in the center and the names of the heroes surrounding it. Because of budget constraints, this proposal was removed from the building plans. The committee then met to consider other alternatives that could be implemented more immediately and less expensively to the public. While all the members were unable to attend every meeting, staff for the committee called each individual and asked for their final vote.

Ms. Woods-Jones shared other options that were considered, such as the rotunda in the new courthouse building. This would be called the "Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Hall of Justice" and would have names of the Hampton heroes around the walls. Another option was the ceremonial naming of King Street to honor Dr. King. This would not require the businesses changing their addresses or other items. It is a significant street that comes all the way from Langley Air Force Base to downtown. While other streets were considered, these would affect businesses and residences. Other options included upgrading the water feature in front of the Hampton Roads Convention Center and identifying a site for a future park or plaza downtown. She stated that the committee focused greatly on downtown locations for all options because they were hoping to integrate with the work of other committees that are looking to revitalize the downtown area. For the park or plaza, the committee identified an area on the northeast corner of Lincoln and King Streets, behind the Public Safety Building. The committee recognizes that there are no resources now, but would want to have a groundbreaking to solidify the fact that it will be a park or plaza in the future.

Ms. Woods-Jones shared the final recommendations of 13 members of the original 16. Ms. Bunting noted that Council might be wondering how the percentages add up on the final recommendations. She stated that the first percentages shown are the numbers from people who chose an option as their first choice. The second percentages show the number of people who chose an option as their second choice. The combined percentages show what percentage of the group chose an option as either their first or second choice.

Ms. Woods-Jones noted that there was no option that received a significant amount of votes over another. Due to the lack of overwhelming consensus, any of the options of the final four recommendations would be acceptable to the committee.

Ms. Bunting thanked Ms. Woods-Jones, especially for taking the initiative to call those who could not attend all the meetings. She noted that she had been asked by Council to determine possible approaches to these suggested projects. She stated that it was considered that downtown would grow over time because of the investment taking place there. There is also a tie to justice by placing a memorial in the courthouse; however, the visitation of something situated adjacent to the courthouse is likely minimal. The Convention Center is considered by some as more for out-of-town visitors, not Hampton residents, but she stated that she does not share that opinion. There are many events that take place at the Convention Center, such as the Bodacious Bazaar and the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) banquet which were both attended by many Hamptonians. She stated that from her position, it seems

that the Convention Center reaches the goal of touching more people, both Hamptonians and visitors, in a more positive way than the courthouse would. She also noted that there were some minor funds left in the Convention Center bond account that can only be used on the building or features that were funded with the initial bond issue, which includes the water feature. The City would be able to use those funds to upgrade the water feature to honor Dr. King and the local heroes if Council chooses this option.

Councilman Stuart stated that he would like the Council to separate the issue of the honorary naming of King Street. He feels it is an excellent choice, having worked there his entire adult life. He stated that, as the Council's representative on the Hampton Arts Commission, the Arts Commission would be willing to work with Procurement to allow Hampton's local artists to look at the water feature currently at the Convention Center, if it is chosen, and have some renderings and costs submitted. He stated that he supports the Convention Center because he feels it is the crossroads for this area. He noted that the Tennis Ball is a great example of not just Hamptonians, but people from Hampton Roads and out-of-state coming to one place.

Vice Mayor Curtis noted that Council is not at the point of actually financing any of the options and asked the City Manager to discuss the potential financial implications of the options other than the Convention Center water feature.

Ms. Bunting stated that any discussions are estimates because projects can be scaled up or down. She noted that ceremonially naming a street is the cheapest option. Signage will be installed to denote that designation, and depending on the type of sign, the price can vary. Some signs can be created within the City, but if something more ornamental is desired, it would be contracted out. She noted that one downside to this, as noted by some of the committee members, is that King Street has a historical designation for the community. King and Queen Streets harken back to the colonial heritage in the area, and there could be those who felt the colonial heritage was being done an injustice. She personally feels that it is a nice blending of the City's cultural and colonial heritage, but there were some committee members who were very strongly against the idea. She stated that renaming another street raises more concerns, asking businesses and residents to change all of their information becomes more complicated. She noted that there are some concerns because of the existence of the street on Hampton University, and the Post Office does not appreciate conflicting addresses, but as long it is a ceremonial naming, it will not cause a problem for the Post Office.

Ms. Bunting stated that the Hall of Justice at the courthouse would not be overly expensive. The idea is nice portraits, perhaps a bust or prominent portrait for Dr. King. The commissioning of the artwork would be the expense.

Ms. Bunting noted that because the fountain was already in place at the Convention Center, the City would only be complementing it. This would cut costs as something would not need to be constructed from start to finish. She stated that while designating a piece of land for a future plaza or park is inexpensive now, the ultimate building of a park with the features would be costly. There is a desire for a water feature, which would need to be created, and would be much more expensive than enhancing what is already available at the Convention Center. She stated that the feature at the Convention Center is very nice, but could be improved. Originally, the City had grander plans for it, but waited in anticipation of it being an option for the Dr. King memorial due to the connection between water and Dr. King's speeches.

Councilman Stuart noted that when King Street crosses Lincoln Street, it becomes Kings Way, just like Queens Way is downtown. The City already has an encapsulated area where it utilizes a different name for historically related purposes. He stated that it wouldn't be paying any disrespect or taking anything away if the honorarium started at Lincoln Street and ran to Langley Air Force Base.

Councilwoman Snead that she does understand the request to have a Hall of Justice, but by putting it in the Circuit Court the City would not be doing itself justice. The Circuit Court is closed on weekends and holidays, and people don't go to court unless they have to. If the City wants to do a true recognition to Dr. King and the local heroes, then she would opt for the Convention Center fountain. She believes that it is centrally located, and whatever is put there can be viewed by citizens and tourists whether or not the Convention Center is open. There is money already in place for an upgrade. She stated that this could become a tourist attraction depending on how it is marketed through the Convention & Visitor Bureau (CVB). She agreed with Councilman Stuart that naming a street should be a separate issue and that both naming a street and upgrading the fountain could be done. She stated that she is not sure she'd be willing to designate a specific plaza, only because she is fiscally concerned about where the City currently is and creating new things that need to be maintained.

Vice Mayor Curtis stated that she agrees with Councilwoman Snead. She believes that a future plaza or park is an indefinite destination for a project that has been discussed since 2010. She also agreed, as someone who frequented the courthouse for many years as the Commonwealth's Attorney, it is not a place where people go unless they absolutely have to. She likes the Convention Center fountain, not only because of what it says to the residents of Hampton, but what it will say to visitors of the City about what and who is valued.

Councilman Hobbs stated that he is in favor of a water feature. He noted that when he was on the committee years ago, a gentleman shared photographs of water features he had visited, and his descriptions of how it affected him and his family were very moving. He believes the Convention Center is the right place to do it. There is a lot of activity there. He stated that he doesn't want to throw expense to the wind, but if the City is going to do it, it needs to do it right. He stated that there were people on the committee who talked about raising public funds and noted that he is in favor of something like that.

Councilman Moffett thanked Ms. Woods-Jones for her service to the committee, to her predecessor Mr. John Johnson, and to the committee itself. He noted that he served as the liaison on the committee at one point, and they were very kind and gracious when he called them to tell them he would not support a statue in the amount of \$250,000 because he didn't feel it was the responsible thing to do with the economy and proposed tax increase. He agreed with those on Council who indicated that they prefer the Convention Center approach because it is already an existing water feature. He noted that the gentleman Councilman Hobbs mentioned ministered at Ebenezer Baptist Church, Dr. King's first church, and is also an architect who initially suggested the water feature at the Convention Center. He stated that he supports the Convention Center as his first option, and if it is possible to select a second option, he supports the renaming on King Street. He stated that he supports the Convention Center because there is already funding that must be spent there, so there will be no additional burden to the taxpayers. He stated that this was important to him, and he believes that Dr. King would

support being honored in a way that would not create a hardship on a locality or its people.

Mayor Wallace noted that there is a lack of awareness of the current design of the water feature incorporated at the Convention Center. The cascading wall inside the Convention Center goes under the floor and then outside to the water feature there, moving towards the Coliseum. If this can be enhanced or developed, the Council should consider that. He stated that he believes the Council is ready to direct the City Manager to have concepts developed for consideration.

Councilman Tuck stated that he agrees with the concept of the water feature at the Convention Center. He noted that the group had identified approximately 140 individuals to be honored, and as time progresses more would be identified. He asked if what is planned would have an opportunity to grow to accommodate future honorees.

Ms. Bunting stated that there seems to be a consensus, so she would like to memorialize this and put the other options to rest. She stated that the City would provide Council with concepts that are solicited. She stated that Council could select an initial group to honor, not all 140 at one time, and the element designed would allow for additions each year. This creates a living monument, with a focus on the ongoing legacy of Dr. King's life through the living works of other people. It will be requested from those submitting design concepts to incorporate that type of feature into what is developed.

Ms. Woods-Jones stated that the notion of the monument continuing on and having a celebration during the month of January was exciting to a number of committee members, because it provide an opportunity to continue to identify heroes in the community.

Mayor Wallace asked if the selection criterion for the local heroes was defined. He stated that the presentation seemed very general. Ms. Woods-Jones stated that it was general, but can be tightened. The committee was interested in distinguished citizens who have made a difference in Hampton. Mayor Wallace asked if the list of 140 potential honorees was from 1619 through today. Ms. Woods-Jones confirmed the timeline. She noted that the list has not been refined and the honorees had not been ranked. Mayor Wallace asked if, when the concepts are brought before Council for approval, a more defined process for selection could be suggested as well. He stated that the City does not want the criterion for entry to be so loose that receiving the honor has no real significance. Ms. Bunting agreed and suggested a Council-appointed committee, similar to the Athletic Hall of Fame committee, which will decide the inductees for a given period of time.

Councilman Hobbs noted that when this was originally discussed years ago, it was hoped that it didn't necessarily need to happen yearly. If a person earned the honor, they could receive it whenever it was appropriate.

Councilman Stuart asked if a determination could be made on moving forward with the honorary street naming. He noted that February is devoted to African American history. He was unsure if there would need to be an official vote or if Council could convey support of the project to move it forward. He noted that the most significant dates would be Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Day or the month of February. Ms. Bunting stated that she had not asked the traffic engineers how quickly signage could be turned around. She noted that she would need direction from the Council on what kind of sign would be

desired, if the typical City signage was acceptable or if a more ornamental sign is more appropriate. Councilman Stuart stated that he believed the City signage was a different color than typical street signs to call attention to it, sitting above the current sign.

Ms. Bunting clarified that the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) requires different colors for different things, if the Council chose to go with a standard sign. She stated that she would share the mechanics of what would be involved in Friday's memorandum.

Ms. Bunting stated that as questions arise over the memorial, the City's response will now be that Council has given clear direction that the water feature at the Convention Center is the preferred option. The City will move the concepts along as quickly as reasonable without forsaking quality.

PRESENTED by Michele Woods-Jones.

2. 14-0065 Wastewater Operations Consent Order Progress Report

Ms. Bunting introduced Mr. Jason Mitchell, Superintendent of Wasterwater & Solid Waste Operations, who would be leading the presentation. She noted that Council has been receiving regular updates from Public Works about the Consent Order process, what the Region has been discussing, and what the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) would accept as a Regional approach. There has been some preliminary guidance from DEQ that they are willing to accept a hybrid Regional plan, but provided a very short timetable for evaluation. All jurisdictions within the Hampton Roads Sanitation District (HRSD) are required to make a decision in February to proceed, or each locality will have to handle the issue alone. Mayor Wallace noted that the DEQ has indicated that there must be unanimous support within HRSD for this process to be accepted. Ms. Bunting confirmed this and noted that there have been questions about what would happen if one locality opts out of a Regional plan, as the rate increases required after improvements made would impact all residents within HRSD. This is also a way for DEQ to ensure complete compliance in the Region. She also introduced Ms. Whitney Katchmark from Hampton Roads Planning District Commission (HRPDC).

Councilman Stuart noted that Poquoson has already voted in support of the Consent Order. He asked if there were any localities that had already voted in opposition, as this would present a different problem. Ms. Bunting stated that at the HRPDC meeting the week before, none had voted in opposition, but there are many localities that have yet to act. Most localities are briefing this month with a planned action for next month.

Mr. Mitchell stated that in August 2013 HRPDC completed the regionalization study, which estimated significant savings to the Region over the next thirty years. It also recommended that all localities transfer their wastewater system assets to HRSD. However, through the process, many localities had concerns with the study, such as potential changes to customer service, limited control of rates, the impact on land use decisions, and the debt some localities would receive from other localities. This includes Hampton.

Mr. Mitchell stated that in October 2013, HRSD and the localities developed a hybrid approach, which will allow for savings to the Region while localities retain ownership of their wastewater systems, including operation and maintenance. HRSD will be allowed

to construct improvements on portions of localities' wastewater system for the Regional Wet Weather Management Plan (RWWMP).

Mr. Mitchell shared a timeline of the regionalization study events, noting that both DEQ and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) have approved the hybrid approach. The deadline for adoption of the developed Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) is February 28, 2014.

Mr. Mitchell shared the responsibilities of HRSD under the MOA. HRSD will work with localities to develop an affordable RWWMP while assuming regulatory liability for wet weather sanitary sewer overflows and supporting modifications of the current Consent Order with DEQ.

Mr. Mitchell shared the locality responsibilities under the MOA. Each locality will operate and maintain its own wastewater collection systems as it currently does, and continue to repair defects and perform work under Capacity Assurance, Management, Operations and Maintenance (CMOM) and the Sanitary Sewer Evaluation Study (SSES).

Mr. Mitchell shared the benefits of agreeing to the MOA for Hampton. The City would maintain its existing system and have control over system expansions, including future developments. There will be relief from legal obligation and financial liability under the Rehabilitation Plan and regulatory liability for wet weather overflows following implementation of the RWWMP. HRSD would upgrade the system and after completion, it will take liability for any wet weather overflow. Costs savings would be passed along to the citizens of Hampton.

Mr. Mitchell stated that the next step is for Council to vote on the adoption of the hybrid regionalization under the MOA by February 28th. He noted that all the councils and commissions in Hampton Roads are reviewing this MOA now and will need to vote before that date.

Councilman Stuart asked for a layman's description of liability relief for the Rehabilitation Plan and RWWMP. Mr. Mitchell stated that each locality has built a Rehabilitation Plan that outlines all the current repairs that need to be made and a timeline to make those repairs. This is a State plan from DEQ. The timeline occurs over a 20 year period. Through conversations with DEQ, the City has found that DEQ is willing to compromise on that plan, if the area uses a hybrid plan. There could be a different timeline and set of repairs required. For the RWWMP, currently, if there is a major overflow, the City can be fined for it. However, HRSD has agreed to do wet weather capacity upgrades, such as bigger pump stations, bigger pipes, and infrastructure improvements. Once those have been completed, HRSD will take over the liability.

Councilman Stuart asked about the encumbrances from land use and developments. He asked if that concern had been addressed in the hybrid plan. Mr. Mitchell stated that with the hybrid plan, the City retains all control for future developments and it would be no different than now. Councilman Stuart stated that whatever originally existed is now gone. Mr. Mitchell confirmed this.

Councilman Stuart noted that one of the initial challenges was that the City would be bearing the brunt of debts others had incurred. He asked if this had been satisfactorily resolved in the hybrid model. Ms. Bunting stated that she was satisfied with the solution.

She commended the Public Works staff, HRPDC, HRSD and each of the localities for trying to find a way to achieve the Regional savings without all of the liabilities. The City maintains a debt-free sanitary sewer system. It has financed improvements in a pay-as-you-go fashion and any debt from years past has been paid off. She noted that there are some localities like Hampton, but many have debt, some of them a significant amount. The City originally would have had to ask its citizens to pay off that debt through a unified rate with HRSD. The current MOA and hybrid plan removes all those considerations and focuses on HRSD taking on the obligations as outlined in the Consent Order for wet weather management on a holistic basis, which achieves Regional savings without having to deal with the debt complexities. She noted that virtually every locality had concerns and it would have been easy to walk away without finding a solution, but instead all the localities worked together to find a creative solution. The last concern was approval from DEQ and EPA, but both organizations have approved it.

Councilman Stuart stated that, knowing Ms. Bunting had some serious reservations initially, he is supportive of approval based on her recommendation.

Councilman Tuck stated that he assumes the City has had some overflows. He asked how the City currently handles those and if there have been liabilities associated with them. Mr. Mitchell stated that there have not been liabilities associated with overflows. There are very few sanitary sewer overflows in the City. The three recent overflows are capacity-related. Some of the upgrades made by HRSD, in areas such as King Street, would resolve those capacity issues.

Vice Mayor Curtis asked if the net effect of this MOA would be a benefit to the taxpayers in the future. Ms. Bunting stated that it would be a benefit. Each locality would be forced to make its own upgrades, without economies in construction. With a Regional approach, HRSD can target the projects that provide the biggest return on investment. Each locality would have also had to raise their rates to accomplish enhancements, but with this agreement, HRSD will create a uniform rate, so there is not a disparity amongst localities. She stated that she believes this is good for economic development in the Region. This may not benefit the citizen directly, but in the overall improvement to the Region.

PRESENTED by Jason, Mitchell, Wastewater Operations Manager.

3. 14-0061 Staff Briefing on Armistead Pointe Park Master Plan Update

Ms. Bunting introduced Mr. Terry O'Neill, Community Development Director, who would be leading the presentation. She noted that the City has been working on an update to the 1998 Armistead Pointe Master Plan. The plan had become outdated, and there was a desire to try and replicate the success of a facility like the Boo Williams Sportsplex, which offers a unique combination of recreational opportunities for citizens and brings economic enhancement to the tax base. She noted that Council had a joint briefing in November with the Planning Commission to receive preliminary information. Since that time, staff has moved forward with the suggestions from Council and began public engagement. A copy of the presentation is attached to these minutes.

Mayor Wallace asked about the green space in the picture of Armistead Pointe. Mr. O'Neill stated that this was an old burrow pit that is on privately held property. It was

dug for a highway project years ago. Mayor Wallace asked if it being a burrow pit prevented it from being developed. Mr. O'Neill stated that it is owned by a family who was not interested in developing it when there were conversations about extending Hampton Roads Center Parkway. They are not interested in selling the property because it is their homestead.

Mr. O'Neill stated that the City is not at a point where any of the information provided is a final recommendation. The broad range of ideas is being refined into a smaller set of options. After meeting in November, the City is now at a point where the community input process is being closed. Those results will be used in the final analysis and concepts. The last community meeting was held last week, and today is the last day for citizens to offer comments online.

Mr. O'Neill stated that Council charged staff at the beginning to look at potential recreation projects, which have been termed "destination recreational facilities," that net both a local recreational need in the community as well as generating economic development revenue. The second charge was to revisit the 1998 Armistead Pointe Master Plan, looking at it with new information and the added community input. He shared the process timeline, which started in July 2013. A final recommendation is expected in late February or early March. He noted that there have been three large community input meetings, the online input portal has been open since the beginning of the process, and there have been additional meetings with community leaders and stakeholder groups, including the Parks & Recreation Advisory Board and the Youth Commission.

Mr. O'Neill noted that although there were concerns, questions, and issues, the November presentation to Council resulted in the staff exploring four major tracks: the community park elements of Armistead Pointe, which are those elements that the community wishes to see on the property itself; possible expansions and additions to the Boo Williams Sportsplex; an enhanced BMX facility; and an aquatics center.

Mr. O'Neill shared the updated information from the BMX facility research and thanked Mr. Jim Wilson, Director of Parks & Recreation, and his staff for their assistance. There have been numerous conversations and meetings with the BMX representatives in Hampton and the City now has an idea of what an enhanced facility would look like and what they would need to make it even more of a destination in the BMX community. Potential locations were discussed in November, and through further conversations, the feedback has been that using a currently unused portion of Briarfield Park is the preferred location if City Council decides to move forward with this. He emphasized that it is an unused portion of Briarfield Park and the location of this facility will not supplant the locations of the ball fields and other amenities that are currently there.

Mr. O'Neill noted that staff has met with various aquatic organizations in the community, including the yearlong swim organizations, representatives of Hampton University, and Hampton City Schools (HCS), to understand what the specific needs are and what a facility would look like if it was pursued. He noted that there is clearly a community and Regional need for this kind of facility. There are very few facilities that cater to the kinds of events and competitions desired. This is probably because these are very expensive facilities to build and cost a lot of money to operate. Staff has also spoken with the Virginia High School League, who reinforced the information received that there is a

scarcity of these facilities in the Commonwealth and the Region. He shared the desired specifications of the various stakeholder groups to make this a preferred facility.

Councilman Stuart noted that there was a listed annual operating cost of \$1.1 million to \$1.35 million and annual operating revenues of \$190,000 to \$320,000. He stated that this seems like a losing fiscal proposition and asked Mr. O'Neill if other residual income would make this a positive for Hampton and the taxpayers. Mr. O'Neill noted that this question is one other localities have wrestled with a lot when considering building similar facilities. The benefits come from quality of life improvements, which are hard to put a value on. For example, as of right now, the City's high school swim teams don't have a place to practice or hold meets. There are also benefits from direct and indirect revenues. The direct revenues are the ones Councilman Stuart noted. The indirect revenues come from the venue attracting visitors from out of the City to meets. This is a combination of how many meets are hosted and how large they are. The City believes, given the information provided from swim organizations, that there is a fairly significant and deep need in this area, which would allow this facility to host a fairly large number of those types of meets that would then provide economic development to the community. He stated that there are no facilities that are directly comparable to the one suggested that will equal out the numbers. A facility such as this will always operate at some level of debt, which varies depending on how successful the City is at attracting events, and varies by program. He noted that some aquatics facilities have not only these features, but include leisure pools or splash parks that allow communities to charge admission fees to offset costs. There are many variables in an aquatics facility.

Councilman Stuart stated that at the end of the day, the Council wants to see the actual numbers to put a value on enhancements made to the City. Mr. O'Neill noted that the City has planned to replace the Old Hampton Community Center pool and facility because of its age. If the City takes the position that it is going to replace that, which would have cost between \$8 million and \$11 million, it can be replaced with this larger, competition level aquatics facility for between \$16 million and \$18 million.

Councilman Stuart noted that the BMX facility had a small operating cost and fairly small construction cost, with break-even revenues. He stated that he initially wondered if the revenues listed included indirect revenues, but Mr. O'Neill had established that it did not with the pool and so not with this facility. He stated that this made the BMX facility an easy investment. Mr. O'Neill stated that the conclusion from the numbers on the BMX facility are just as described by Councilman Stuart. The reach for this facility is narrower, but the facility can sustain itself. Councilman Stuart stated that the City needs to work on getting the numbers for the pool to work like the BMX facility. He stated that both of these ventures are exciting in their own way.

Vice Mayor Curtis noted that she understood the difference between direct and indirect revenues, but asked what the operational revenues represented. She asked if the City would be charging citizens for the use of the facilities. Mr. O'Neill stated that it is his understanding that there will be direct fees charged, both in terms of potential subscriptions as well as hosting meets and events, with teams or participants paying a registration fee. Additional revenue would come from concessions and other sales of products on site. There is a proposed "pro shop." There is also a potential for the National BMX organization to support certain events here, which is also part of the equation.

Councilman Hobbs noted that when his family travelled for BMX, most cities levied a fee for each rider that participated. He stated that in Winchester, there was an additional \$3 fee to register for a State or National event. He noted that this is a normal method of obtaining income. Vice Mayor Curtis asked if that revenue would come to the City and if it was currently being charged now. Mr. Wilson stated that the City is not currently charging those fees, but it would come to the City if and when implemented.

Councilwoman Snead stated that she saw the BMX facility as a public/private partnership. She asked if the expectation is that the City will build and operate the facility. She thought it would be a collaboration. Mr. Wilson stated that the current track at Gosnold Hope Park is 35 years old. It was a public/private partnership, where the City leased an area of the park and gave the group old clay and debris, as well as permits to build the track. Just like a little league or other organization, they managed and operated it. In the past they've rebuilt the track, with different sanctioned organizations redesigning it, with recycled materials from the City, such as the old bleachers that had been removed from the Tennis Center and old lighting from athletic fields. Now that the City is exploring building it at a new location, it will be a more intensive partnership, where they lease the facility and work out user fees with the City. He noted that the business license is already done.

Councilwoman Snead asked if the \$800,000 to \$1.1 million construction costs would come from the City. Mr. Wilson stated that this price includes relocating one of the entrance roads into the proposed location of Briarfield Park, tree and land clearing, and other environmental considerations. He stated that the price is a rough estimate. Councilwoman Snead asked if the City would pay for construction but then lease it to the BMX organization. Mr. Wilson stated that the details are still being discussed and the determination of who will pay for what hasn't been worked out yet. Mayor Wallace stated that the presumption is that unless something else is agreed upon, the City will absorb the debt service costs. Mr. Wilson confirmed that the City would absorb those costs.

Mr. O'Neill noted that whatever project is moved forward, if any, staff will have to spend time talking with the various groups about what the arrangement and partnerships will be. Currently, the staff is only making fair judgments and assumptions because none of the groups have been approached about specifics on future arrangements.

Ms. Bunting noted that with an aquatics center, there would be leases year-round to competitive swim teams who desired to practice. She stated that on the Southside, there is only one pool that meets the demands of three teams, and it is a military pool that they are concerned they will be losing access to. She stated that in addition to the Peninsula teams, the City may also be able to capture some of the Southside teams. She noted that the meet fees are like BMX rider fees described by Councilman Hobbs. She stated that there would additionally be various aquatics programs offered, as is already done at Old Hampton, such as water aerobics classics, where fees would be charged. She stated that if the City built a facility with additional leisure components, there might be an annual subscription fees for residents only and daily rates for nonresidents. She stated that depending on the configuration, there are a range of opportunities.

Vice Mayor Curtis stated the estimated operating revenues are the fees only and don't include the indirect tax revenues. Ms. Bunting confirmed and emphasized that these numbers are very preliminary and items such as lease arrangements would need to be discussed before a decision could be made to invest or not invest in any of the projects.

Until negotiations take place, there is no way to determine if estimated revenues are too high or too low. Mayor Wallace stated that the construction costs are more definitive than revenue projections.

Councilman Stuart noted that having a miniature waterpark adds revenue for aquatics facilities. Ms. Bunting noted that this was what the consultant has said. She stated that the next phase on any of these projects is to visit sites that have these different facilities. She recommended that a delegation of staff and Councilmembers go to Roanoke County, where such an aquatics center exists, to explore their financials. She stated that it is reported in the Roanoke Times that their facility makes a profit each year, but it would need to be determined if they are only talking about operating revenues or if they are including debt service. She noted that this facility does not have a competition pool and is purely recreational, so a facility with a competition pool would also need to be visited. She emphasized that there is a lot more work to do to ensure that staff is properly advising Council on the economics of any of the proposed projects. Councilman Stuart stated that there are no pools on the Peninsula that meet the needs of the area, and now Council is learning there is also a dearth of this on the Southside. As there is an established demand, he would like to continue to explore the possibility of an aquatics center.

Councilwoman Snead stated that she doesn't want citizens to think the City is ready to build an aquatics center with an annual operating cost of \$1.1 million to \$1.3 million that only generates revenues up to \$320,000 a year. She noted that the indoor waterpark features have not been added to those numbers, as well as, if it became a Regional or National competition venue, the indirect revenues. She does not want the citizens to think the City is considering something that could not possibly benefit the citizens.

Ms. Bunting stated that the City is not prepared to say that all the direct and indirect revenues would add up to a good deal for the City. She believes all the options presented today are worth exploring further. Nothing has been found to rule anything out, but details haven't been worked out to start a project in the immediate future, either. She emphasized that it was very, very unlikely that a competition venue will result in full cost recovery for the aquatics center. She stated that usually an aquatics facility has part economic benefit and part community benefit. She stated that if this was a barrier for Council, staff can stop moving forward on this item now.

Mayor Wallace asked what else the City was doing to provide a community asset that does not necessarily pay for itself because of ancillary benefits that accrue to the community to offset that burden. Ms. Bunting noted that out of all the community recreational programs, whether it is sports fields, tennis courts, or any other community areas, none of them pay for themselves. They all have various cost recoveries depending on the programs that are offered. It is a policy judgment as to whether it makes sense or not.

Mr. O'Neill stated that staff continued to explore an addition to the Boo Williams Sportsplex. Staff is pretty confident that the addition would entail a new 200-meter indoor track facility, essentially separating the track from the basketball facility. It has been revealed that having these elements combined produces some compromises in functionality and scheduling. Additionally, four new basketball courts would be added. One of the most prevalent questions received has been why an additional four courts should be included when there are already eight. Mr. O'Neill stated that it is related to

the competition. The competitive facilities that are being built around the country that cater to the same kinds of events are now competing based on the number of courts. The more courts available, the more participants included. Most of the tournaments are limited to a small window of time, so more courts mean more teams which mean more visitors are coming to the City. He noted that the Sportsplex is already a proven commodity in its ability to bring revenue into the community. The consultants estimate that this addition would raise the existing numbers by 50-75%.

Councilman Stuart asked about the potential revenue with track related sports and if the season was complementary to basketball. Mr. O'Neill stated that currently the track and basketball courts are collocated in the facility. This compromises the seating capacity for the basketball venue, which the facility would like to increase. He noted that the track season is also separate from the basketball season, so the facility is missing out on events because priority is given to the basketball tournaments. By separating the courts from the track, it will lengthen the amount of time during the year the Sportsplex is used. It also provides, depending on the final partnership, a much needed indoor track venue for the high schools. When not being used as a track, the inside of the track can be used for a multipurpose indoor field, which helps support practices for schools and leagues.

Councilman Stuart stated that this venue is similar to the BMX venue, in that there is already a history of success. He stated that the operating revenues compared to the construction operating costs are positive. The City would be retrofitting a facility that is already successful in its own market. Mr. O'Neill stated that the consultants are confident that the numbers presented for this facility are accurate because the estimates are based on real numbers.

Councilman Stuart asked what would need to be done for parking expansion at the Sportsplex. Mr. O'Neill stated that parking would need to be expanded, even if nothing is done to the facility. Calculations will be done if the Council decides to move forward on this item.

Mr. O'Neill shared the community elements that citizens have expressed an interest in seeing at Armistead Pointe. There were 140 residents that responded to the online survey. At the community meeting the previous week, the preferred amenities mimicked what was expressed online. The newest input that was overlooked originally was a community center or space that could be used for neighborhood organizations, youth groups and others. There was general support for the facilities presented for the Boo Williams expansion and new BMX and aquatics facilities.

Mr. O'Neill noted that some concerns mentioned included the lack of community center and library, with many harkening back to the original plan in 1998 that included these facilities. Parking, flooding, and paying for the new facilities were also among the concerns. He noted that it was interesting that the preferred concept by the public who responded was the most aggressive use of park space. He shared the proposed graphic that citizens preferred.

Mr. O'Neill stated that the next month will be spent finalizing the information and developing a range of recommendations for Council. He noted that if one or more of these options are chosen, the City Manager has already mentioned that it would be wise to visit facilities in other localities that are similar to those proposed here. This was done

when the City was working on the Convention Center as well. More detailed design and cost estimating will also be done in the next month.

Councilman Tuck noted that Mr. O'Neill mentioned the desire for a community center. He stated that he has heard from three civic leagues, Tidemill Machen, Riverdale, and MacGruder Heights, and they are concerned about providing something for seniors. He stated that he believes the largest concentration of seniors in the City is in those areas. There is no place for meetings or recreational activities. Meetings are currently held at schools, and when schools are closed, they are unable to meet. He asked if there was some consideration for accommodating the desire for a community center. Mr. O'Neill stated that staff has already discussed exploring the concept of a community center as one of the options for recommendation. He stated that the community deserves to have the City explore that option. Ms. Bunting stated that she is going to contact those associations to see how they would feel if the City was able to make the building that currently houses the Teen Center more available for seniors during the day, so that a separate building does not have to be constructed. When the Teen Center was first opened, it housed the Performance Learning Center for HCS during the day; therefore it could not be made available for other uses. As HCS has consolidated programs, the Performance Learning Center has been moved into the Campus at Lee, giving the City that space to use during the day. While the contract made when purchasing the property prohibits certain fitness activities for non-young adults, it does not preclude meeting space, social activities, and recreational non-fitness activities. Before committing to building another building, the City will explore all options. Councilman Tuck stated that this was a valid concern and he appreciates that idea.

Councilman Tuck noted that the City only accommodated approximately 60% of the participants in the events at the Sportsplex in Hampton hotels. He stated that this suggests that having an event at the Sportsplex and event at the BMX facility or aquatics center would not capture some of the indirect revenues because there would not be room. Mr. O'Neill stated that staff has discussed this at length, specifically with Ms. Sallie Grant-DiVenuti, Executive Director of the Hampton Convention & Visitor Bureau. There is the belief that there is a hotel inventory challenge that must be dealt with somehow. This is definitely connected to the success on a number of fronts to bring visitors to the City. He noted that one way to motivate the private sector is to create greater demand. He stated that the City needs to be cognizant that if it doesn't proceed with some of the development, there is the risk of not being competitive in the markets it is in. Mayor Wallace noted that there is also the issue of quality of the facilities already within the City's inventory, and there is a question of the hotel properties being maintained to a standard that is attractive to those visiting the City. Another issue is demand. He noted that the City has been trying to market a site for hotel construction for some time. The issue is always about demand, which needs to be created. Mr. O'Neill noted that Mr. Leonard Sledge, Director of Economic Development, and Ms. Grant-DiVenuti have been leading an effort to assess the market, opportunities and challenges with the City's current hotels. Ms. Bunting noted that there are some hotels in the City that have begun to reinvest in their properties through renovation with success. She noted that the owners of the Hampton Holiday Inn Express were Nationally recognized for their renovations and Courtyard Marriott has also undergone renovations recently. She stated a solution is a combination of new hotels and existing hotels making reinvestments in their properties. Without the demand, these things are less likely to happen.

Councilman Tuck noted that the consultant also spoke on the challenge people have finding the Sportsplex and this was one reason why collocation with a competition pool should not be pursued. Recently, a citizen on the street had asked him how to get to the Sportsplex. This is a major attraction. He asked if there was a way to put up additional signage, including signs on the interstate. This would help especially if the facility is expanded. Ms. Bunting stated that the City has a VDOT supported way-finding signage program that is out to bid now. It will not completely address the situation, but it will enhance signage within the community. She stated that she will request Mr. Tony Reyes, Director of Public Works, work with VDOT to determine if the facility is at the level where it can qualify for the interstate signage. She stated that there are certain levels of visitation that have to be reached to qualify for that.

Councilwoman Snead commended Mr. O'Neill, his staff, and the community for this plan. She stated that she is an advocate for community park elements, but she was also concerned with how the City would pay for it. She asked if anyone had suggested that a portion of this land be set aside for a future economic activity, such as something to complement the Sportsplex like a bowling alley or arcade facility, to help generate revenue that could offset some of the costs of doing some of the community elements. Mr. O'Neill stated that staff has looked at something like that, and it comes down to what the Council wants to do. As a long-standing policy, particularly related to critical areas like Coliseum Central and downtown, the City tries to be very judicious about what public land is used for, and not get into competition with private land owners and investors for uses that they might be able to leverage. This has always led the City to reserve public lands for things that are uniquely done by the public for the most part. He stated that this philosophy has been supported by some of the City's key land owners and constituents in Coliseum.

Councilwoman Snead suggested that the City could sell some of this land. She stated that she is an advocate of trying to generate some revenue at this location. Currently, there appears to be a level of expectation that the City will provide a community park, and the City does not have a way to pay for it. She stated that the City should look at selling some of this land, so there is something there to complement whatever the City puts there.

PRESENTED by Terry P. O'Neill, Director of Community Development.

4. 14-0069 Buckroe Water/Splash Park

Ms. Bunting introduced Mr. Wilson, who would provide concept pictures for Council. She stated that this topic originated at a strategic work session in late 2012, where Council was asked to identify various projects that were short-term, mid-term, or long-term priorities. This fell into short-term priorities and funds were put into the recommended budget. Subsequently, during the budget conversations, this project, along with other short-term priorities, was effectively put on hold. She stated that she believed Councilmen Stuart and Tuck requested this be placed on the agenda to bring some resolution to the item. A copy of the presentation has been attached to these minutes.

Mr. Wilson shared an overview of the proposed location for the Buckroe Splash Park, near the new restroom facility and close to the playground. He noted that the focus is for children 10 years of age and younger. The first concept has approximately 13 different features at 16 different locations. The pad is 50'x50' with the water feature being 45'x45'.

The second concept retains the same theme as the playground with the "S.S. Buckroe" and pirates. It is also 50'x50', has 11 features in 22 locations.

Mr. Wilson stated that the decision was made to build this park, although it would cost more money to build than the initially proposed smaller one, but will be easier to maintain by being square. Other amenities are also more easily placed around it, such as park benches, fences and sidewalk. The fences would prevent vandalism and allow control for who is allowed in, as the focus is for family groups.

Mr. Wilson shared a construction cost breakdown of the first two proposals. He noted that the sidewalks would allow for less sand from the beach and mulch from the nearby playground to end up in the splash park, as well as allow the children an area to clean off before heading to either of those areas. He provided the estimate of \$462,500, which can be decreased depending on the contractor.

Mr. Wilson shared an operational cost breakdown of the first two proposals. He stated that he worked with Newport News Waterworks on the water cost estimation. This covers the loss of water from evaporation and additional circumstances. The cost of utilities was an estimation based on discussions with vendors of different parks of this size. The cost would be approximately \$41,120 for a three month operating period. He noted that this raises the discussion on whether this is an amenity that will be free to the public or if there will be a charge to use it.

Mr. Wilson stated that a smaller splash park is 19'x20' with 9 water features at 12 locations. He shared a cost breakdown for the smaller park. The estimated operational cost is \$38,000 and estimated construction cost is \$391,900.

Ms. Bunting noted that when the park was discussed previously, it was approximated at \$200,000. She stated that this was at a different site and significantly smaller. She stated that some of the costs could be removed, such as fencing, but the fencing is important, particularly as the facility is near the road. The fencing was not included in the original design because it was at a different location. If Council wishes to proceed with a splash park, staff will need direction as to what features, what size, and what additional amenities are desired. She noted that the ornamental fencing is a significant part of the cost.

Vice Mayor Curtis noted that she was not on Council when the strategic priorities sessions took place. She asked if this project was funded. Ms. Bunting stated that Councilmembers identified what they would like to see done in 1-2 years for the short-term, 3-5 years for the mid-term, and 5+ years for the long-term. This splash park was identified at the time as a short-term priority. She stated that when she prepared the proposed budget, she included it at the price estimated at the time, which was approximately \$200,000. There were other short-term priorities in the same category, such as the proposed Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. statue at \$250,000 and Tucker Cemetery improvements like parking and signage. All three totaled \$550,000 in the proposed budget. Councilmembers felt that these projects moved forward a little too quickly, so each project was pulled for various reasons and Council put that money into a short-term Council priority capital project account. The only thing taken out of that account to date was something that emerged as a priority, a contraband archeological dig before the development of the Harbor Square site. Most of that money is still in that account, pending resolution of these items.

Vice Mayor Curtis asked how this project was originally chosen as a short-term priority. She asked if there had been a community survey or other process. Ms. Bunting stated that Councilman Stuart made a recommendation about it based upon constituent concerns he had heard and personal experiences where families with little children did not want their children on the beach for various reasons. Councilman Stuart stated that he desired to complement the Buckroe experience for Hampton's families. As of right now, there is only the sun, the ocean, and the sand. He stated that whatever shape the park takes is not as essential as the fact that this particular area doesn't disturb the other units that are there and there is plumbing already as close as possible. It also buttresses against the playground, which is the one amenity for children of a certain age, and there are full grown trees nearby. He stated that part of the concept is that shade is safer for children. He stated that splash parks are nice for toddlers because they are not in scorching hot sand. He stated that this would complete the Buckroe experience for families with children of all ages. He noted that Norfolk has a splash park at the Botanical Gardens that is always full, and Portsmouth has at least two. He noted that the high construction cost was a little disconcerting compared to the prior numbers and he would like to see it more cost effective. He does not feel the operating expenses are particularly high considering the enhancement it offers.

Councilman Stuart noted that there were legal concerns with the Tucker Cemetery that put those plans on hold, and there was a decision that the statue was not necessarily where Council wanted to go for Dr. King. He felt at the time that the splash park was caught up with the concerns for those other projects. He noted that this was good news because a new spot was chosen and originally staff was considering doing it across the street which would not have worked as well.

Councilman Tuck stated that he regularly attends the meetings in Buckroe held by the Buckroe Improvement League and the Buckroe Civic Association. He stated that this is a desired feature, but a priority for that area is benches and shade. He stated that he was put off by the \$400,000 price tag. He was comfortable with the originally quoted \$200,000. He also recognized that having kids crossing the street to get to the splash park would be inadvisable. He agreed that the new location was a better idea, and would like to see that figure reduced. He stated that Buckroe is a Regional attraction and there is a need for something additional for children. Ms. Bunting noted that approximately \$100,000 of the price is for the fence. She stated that the staff wasn't initially focused on the splash park being for younger kids exclusively. She stated that other splash parks would not be as nice as this. She specifically mentioned the splash area at Peninsula Town Center which is open to kids of all ages. If the City is going to specifically target younger children, a fence would be necessary, to prohibit kids from running into the street and to keep older kids out. If it is an open splash area that anyone can use, then there is no need for a fence. She stated that the fence has to be recommended in good conscience, but can be removed. That item alone is 25% of the cost. Staff has tried to work more appropriately to a different site and other considerations. If Council wants this project to move forward at \$200,000, staff can go back and see what can be accomplished within that budget.

Vice Mayor Curtis noted that she had only been on Council for a few months, but had received the emails that Councilman Tuck had referenced with people asking for benches and shade trees. She stated that she has not heard citizens asking for a splash pad and she had not seen a plan for it in the Capital Improvement Plan. She stated that

she believes there should be a process from which a project like this is considered. She noted her concern about the \$400,000 price, and other than the fact that it came up at a Council retreat, she hasn't seen any evidence that there is a great public desire for this project or that if Council wanted to spend \$200,000 at Buckroe that this would be the way the citizens wanted it to be spent. She stated that she would use it if it was built, and believes it would be a lovely amenity to have. However, she doesn't believe it is her job as a Councilmember to build something she would like without a process. She asked if the City could do a survey or something else to see if there was significant support for this project. Ms. Bunting stated that the City has done surveys on concepts before that are not within the normal parameters of the budget, with the most recent example being the tethering law recommendations, so it could be done if it is desired by Council. The City could also visit with the two civic associations in Buckroe, although she cautioned that the beach at Buckroe is seen as a community-wide asset, not Buckroe exclusively. If the City only talks to the Buckroe civic associations, there might not be a full range of community sentiment.

Councilwoman Snead stated that she appreciated Mr. Wilson's efforts in getting the information to Council. She stated that she never felt that the City should put a splash pad at Buckroe because there is plenty of water there. She stated that more importantly, at this juncture, with the budgetary issues the City is facing, adding new projects to the City budget should be limited. The City has many wonderful facilities that need to be maintained already. She stated that several citizens have approached her about the conditions of the existing parks. If the City was to spend \$400,000, it needs to be spent maintaining what it already has.

Councilman Moffett applauded the creativity and innovation that Councilmen Stuart and Tuck have supported. He stated that he could not in good conscience move forward on the project without a clear community consensus. He stated that he did not want to plan something so close to budget, especially since not all citizens understood the different funding sources for different projects. He stated that there are too many unknowns, and there could be a shortfall in both the City and HCS budget that he doesn't know about yet. He stated that it was important to demonstrate to the citizens that Council is thinking this through. He stated that he is not against the idea and emphasized his appreciation for the innovation of Councilmen Stuart and Tuck. He stated that this could be a project that Council reconsiders when there is additional information from the community. He asked how much was spent on the study. Mr. Wilson stated that it was only his time and staff's time. Councilman Moffett asked if he had created the concepts. Mr. Wilson stated that he had created them at the request of Council. Councilman Moffett asked how much staff time was spent on this project. Mr. Wilson stated that several hours had been spent. Councilman Moffett asked if there was a cost estimate of the time it took. Mr. Wilson stated that he could provide this for Council if desired. Councilman Moffett stated that he didn't want to continue to use staff time on this with no decision made. He stated that Council needed to decide to either move forward, make modifications, or not move forward. He emphasized that Council needs to be clear in its direction to staff to avoid wasting staff time. He also emphasized that he would need a clear consensus from the community that this project is a priority because there are other needs in the City.

Mayor Wallace noted that there is a desire for economic return on an investment. This particular project has no economic return associated with it, which is similar to many of the amenities in the City. It would be a judgment issue for the community.

Councilman Stuart suggested tabling the topic and moving on.

Councilman Tuck noted that Council had spent an hour looking at alternatives for the Armistead Pointe area that add value at a cost of \$800,000 to \$38.5 million in capital expenditures. The money for this project is money that was approved for last year's budget, so it is already there and available. He noted that when he attempted to provide cost saving measures last year, none were approved. Approximately \$550,000 has been available since July 1, 2013 and will be available until June 30, 2014. While that money could be used elsewhere, it was appropriated for projects such as this one. He noted that he does not agree with spending \$400,000 and would like to see the cost lowered, but feels that Buckroe is a Regional attraction. He doesn't feel that every situation should be valued on how much time staff invests in it.

Councilwoman Snead noted that the money was put into one account because there was a concern from some on Council that the items the money had been appropriated for had not been discussed in detail by Council. There was no prioritization done after the retreat, which was brainstorming. The money appropriated was put into one account to avoid raising the expectation that those projects would be moving forward without more discussion. Ms. Bunting stated that when staff left the retreat, they thought it was a direction to move forward. Once it was put into the budget and concerns were raised, staff realized that more work needed to be done before funding those proposals. Everything that was put on the short-term list that did not already have funding, staff tried to put into the budget. Another example of this was the Franklin Street extension. The City was successful in obtaining a VDOT revenue sharing project that required a match. This was put into the budget, but was not rolled into the account with the others because it was VDOT money. It was originally put on hold because the City wanted to wait until after the downtown consultants had presented their findings, to see if the project would need to be changed. When it was clear the project was still necessary, the City moved forward. She emphasized there was an attempt to fund anything on the short-term list, and the three projects previously discussed were rolled into one account when some Councilmembers requested more information before moving forward.

Councilwoman Snead emphasized that Council was not just accepting the huge numbers on the proposed Armistead Pointe projects. She stated that there will be a cost-benefit analysis to each of those projects before the City moves forward, so Councilmembers need to be more careful about the way they word the Council's take on discussions.

Mayor Wallace asked Council if staff should move forward with the splash park or move in another direction.

Councilman Stuart stated that it would be visionary and a remarkable complement to Buckroe, but he gets the general sense that there is not a consensus to move forward. He noted that it had been a poor decision on his part to let this project get rolled into the other two projects, to the detriment of the young families in the City. Mayor Wallace noted that no one was trying to alienate any particular group, and every project has those for it and those against it.

Mayor Wallace stated that he believes the sentiment from Council is that the project should not move forward.

PRESENTED by Jim Wilson, Director of Parks and Recreation.

5. 14-0066 FY15 Budget Preview - Real Estate Assessment Update and Community Input on Capital Improvement Plan

Mayor Wallace noted that this is the first of the budget previews provided by the City Manager. Ms. Bunting introduced Mr. Brian Gordineer, City Assessor, who would be presenting on the City's real estate assessment process, and Ms. Gloria Washington, Budget Director, who would be presenting on the revenue guideline adopted last year. She noted that this process isn't started earlier because of the way the revenues for the City flow and reliable estimates are not available immediately. As soon as reasonable estimates are available, they are shared. Joint meetings with HCS and Council are planned for February. Copies of the presentations are attached to these minutes.

Mr. Gordineer stated that his office had completed the reassessment of the City's 50,913 parcels. Of those parcels, approximately 21,000 have changed in value, 92% of which are decreases. He shared a graph displaying the total value of real estate in the City, which has fallen to \$13.8 billion, a trend that has been experienced for the last 5 years. The decrease this year is less than the percentage of the previous two years, a total of .9% decrease. Approximately 27% of the land book value is exempt from taxation by designation or classification, as well as some credit programs related to rehabilitation, agricultural use and tax relief for the elderly and veterans. This reduction results in \$10.1 billion in taxable value. This amount decreased by 1.21% from the previous year, which is less than in previous years.

Mr. Gordineer shared a chart of the total taxable change of the land book value over the last five years. The decrease of 1.21% is a decrease from the previous year. He noted that FY2010 was the last flat year, with no increases or decreases.

Mr. Gordineer shared a chart breaking down the types of land in the City's land book. He noted that residential properties constitute more than half of the land book value. He shared a chart detailing the changes in each type of land over the last five years. He stated that multifamily and commercial segments of the market have trended around 0% over the five year period, which has helped moderate the more dramatic changes in the residential values. He noted that multifamily often acts in reverse of residential. This could be because those who cannot afford a home generally live in an apartment, which drives the value of apartments up in the market.

Mr. Gordineer shared a chart on the residential value changes. He stated that over half of the residential properties' owners this year did not see a change in their assessment. He noted that it is more important to observe the trend over a five year period. In that period, 79% of residential property owners have seen more than a 10% decrease in the value of their property.

Mayor Wallace asked how this decrease compares Regionally. Mr. Gordineer stated that he did not have specific numbers for residential property, but does have a chart detailing the overall changes, which he feels are indicative of the residential market.

Mr. Gordineer shared a map detailing the percentage change of this year's assessments. The map illustrates that the decreases experienced this year, like previous

years, are not isolated to particular areas of the City. Because the City has experienced a multiyear decline in value, looking at a map over a five year period would show the entire City covered in blues and purples, indicating a decrease in value of 8% or greater. He emphasized that the City is acting the same in all areas and does not have particular spots that are acting worse or better.

Mr. Gordineer shared a chart detailing the cumulative declines in the land book value since FY2011 of the neighboring localities that have provided data to the City. Hampton falls in the middle with an overall decline of 11.1%. He stated that he could not compare numbers for this year because the City is usually the first to release numbers each year. He noted that some localities may have leveled off or will increase a small amount, but he believes there will be localities that are still decreasing as Hampton has. Mr. Gordineer noted that this year's values are based on the sales that occurred during 2013. He stated that the Assessor's Office is always working a year behind, using data from the previous year to establish the estimated value for the next year.

Mr. Gordineer shared a chart of the foreclosures that have taken place since 2006. He stated that foreclosures are one of the challenges the City is facing in the year ahead. There were over 4000 transfers this year, which is a good sign as the number had previously been below 3000. Of those 4000, almost 12% were foreclosures. This is definitely affecting the market, as those foreclosures are on the market competing with properties that are for sale by owners.

Mr. Gordineer shared a chart of the percentage of tax exempt properties from the last five years. He stated that this is also a concern for the future. The percentage continues to rise, and is 26.8% this year.

Councilman Stuart noted that HCS owns a certain amount of property, and asked where the growth in tax exempt properties was occurring. He asked if it was churches moving into commercial spaces, state level programs that fall onto the City, or something else. Mr. Gordineer stated that he believed the majority of this year's increase was the Veteran's program from the State. He noted that this was the Commissioner of the Revenue's territory and he could not speak to it. Mayor Wallace asked what program Mr. Gordineer meant when he said "Veteran's program." Ms. Bunting stated that this is the program the State General Assembly authorized after a constitutional amendment process that voters approved to provide 100% tax relief for Veteran's with 100% service connected disabilities. While the City supports Veterans, this is not a means tested program and falls disproportionately on Hampton because it is known to be a great place for retirees to locate after service due to the Veterans' Affairs (VA) Medical Center. This results in a higher dollar value that must be written off for this program. It is something that taxpayers in Hampton are having to shoulder the burden of more than taxpayers across the Commonwealth. Councilman Tuck asked if it extends to the spouse of the Veteran after death. Ms. Bunting stated that there have been various bills that have looked at that situation, but not all have been successful. She stated that she cannot speak to that status currently and the Commissioner of the Revenue would have the most current updates. Mr. Gordineer stated that the dollar estimate of assessed value related to the program, as provided by the Commissioner of the Revenue, is \$232 million for this year. He noted that this exemption did not exist three years ago.

Mr. Gordineer shared a chart with the accuracy rate of the assessments done in the last four years. He stated that this was important to ensure that the real estate tax burden is

spread appropriately based on the assessed values of homes. He stated that the State Department of Taxation does an assessment/sales ratio study every year, and the City's accuracy rate is approximately at 100%. About a month ago, the study was released for FY2013, and the City achieved 102% sales ratio.

Ms. Bunting stated that 1.21% decrease in real estate value translates into less real estate taxes collected. She noted that the City has a high collection rate. She asked Ms. Washington to review the revenue guideline adopted last year. She noted that staff understands the Council approved a sizeable increase last year to offset some historical losses in revenues after polling the community. It was suggested by the community, the Finance Committee, and Council that incremental adjustments be made in the future, rather than one large increase. She emphasized that the adopted policy was a guideline.

Ms. Washington noted that last year, the Finance Committee presented a policy change that Council adopted on May 8th to be preemptive in looking at revenue tax guidelines to equalize rates in the future. There had been a guideline in the past, but it only addressed assessments that were increasing and not the inverse. The new policy suggests that when assessments increase the real estate tax should be adjusted downward and with decreases the real estate tax should be adjusted upward. She noted that one penny equaled approximately \$1 million dollars previously, and that is still true for this current fiscal year. This year's 1.21% decline is equivalent to approximately \$1.3 million less for FY2015. She noted that because of the funding formula, HCS shares in both increases and decreases of 61.83% of real estate property and personal property.

Ms. Washington noted that there had been much discussion about limiting the tax rate adjustment by the resident income growth. In working with the Director of Finance, she stated that they had done research with the Bureau of Economic Analysis, and the latest data was of 2012 showing the personal income growth change of 2.63%. She stated that the City would be within its guidelines with regards to the resident income growth. Another factor discussed was inflationary costs, and it was determined that the governing body would be given flexibility in that regard.

Ms. Washington noted that the City is looking at a property assessment decrease, and the application of the guideline needs to be a tool for Council and the City Manager to use to increase the tax rate based on a minimum assessment decline of one penny on the tax rate as compared to the previous year. Cost pressures would be taken into account as part of the budget deliberations, and the City always examines other revenue opportunities it may have. As part of the process, the City is looking at its services budget and activities to see if there are any economies of scale or reductions that could be made. She emphasized that this is always part of the City's process. She stated that flexibility will be provided to Council regarding the application of the tax rate policy.

Ms. Washington noted that to the extent that budgetary needs require the tax rate to be adjusted higher or lower than the factors identified regarding the resident income growth or other inflationary factors, the City Manager and Council will explicitly explain those budget driving factors to the residents of Hampton.

Ms. Bunting stated that the 5-year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) is developed separately from the operating budget, but the first year of the CIP rolls into the budget, so the two converge at this point. Given that the CIP public input process has been completed, which is done before recommendations are made for the 5-year CIP, she

introduced Ms. Robin McCormick, Communications Strategist, to provide the survey results. She stated that there were two public forums as well as online survey opportunities. A copy of the presentation is attached to these minutes.

Ms. McCormick stated that there was a 300% increase in participation this year. She noted that a lot of this was driven by the recreational facilities that Council has been discussing. There were younger people participating, again, because of the recreational component. She stated that there was less racial representation than is traditional, and proportionally more people from the Buckroe, Fox Hill and Willow Oaks area than from other parts of the City. She stated that nearly 25% of the people who took the survey reported that they do not live in Hampton.

Ms. McCormick stated that they did not repoll on projects that were already funded in the 5-year CIP from last year's polling. The polling focused on items such as school and building maintenance, or new projects from a variety of sources. She stated that there were not hugely different responses from the in-person forums.

Ms. McCormick stated that respondents were allowed to choose two projects per category. For simplicity, the results were totaled by votes. She shared a chart for the Economic Development & Master Plans category in which blighted property acquisition received the largest support. Other items included neighborhood projects and recreational projects. She stated that the Coliseum Drive pedestrian overpass, which the Coliseum Business Improvement District (BID) has requested for several years, received a significant number of votes. She noted that the chart showed only projects that received more than 10% of votes.

Ms. McCormick shared a chart for the Maintenance category. There were only three real projects included, with some smaller golf course improvement projects. There was strong support for all three big projects, with maintenance of the schools receiving the largest support.

Ms. McCormick shared a chart for the Public Safety category. She noted that the projects were very close in public support. She stated that she didn't believe the public was able to rank them a lot. She noted that some of the projects have received grant funding from the Attorney General's Office, so some will now be funded by the State.

Ms. McCormick shared a chart for the Streets & Infrastructure category. She stated that the miscellaneous repairs option was not named projects, but a certain amount put in the budget every year to fix bridges, road problems and a lot of small projects, and it received the highest number of votes. She stated that the Public Works Department was requesting money to put generators at the busiest third of the City's pump stations so in the event of a power outage, there was backup pumping. She stated that she believes the pump station expansion was in Hampton Roads Center North.

Ms. McCormick shared a chart from the Waterways & Drainage category. She stated that the favorite was by far neighborhood drainage programs. She noted that Gosnold's Hope is a maintenance dredging in the boating area. Most of the rest of the projects were wetlands, bio-retention or other water quality programs, some of which might help flooding.

Ms. McCormick shared a chart from the New Facilities/Major Upgrades category. She stated that maintenance of the parks the City already has received the biggest support. She stated that this does not mean new facilities, but that the parks need so much work, it will require significant funding above the annual maintenance costs. She noted that Briarfield Park redesign was also a big project that would redo all the fields and stated that the tennis complex is already under construction.

Ms. McCormick noted that the New Facilities/Major Upgrades category was the one area where putting all respondents together made a significant difference. Residents and nonresidents essentially voted the same on all other categories. She stated that the results and split are to be expected. Visitors to the City voted most strongly for the BMX Park. Gosnold's Hope Park was second highest, most likely resulting from the BMX attendees spending a lot of time in that park. She noted that Briarfield Park, one of the proposed relocations for the BMX Park, was third highest. She stated that these were strongly BMX voters. Almost all 200 nonresident respondents put BMX Park as their first choice. When asked to vote for an additional item if they could vote again, they all still voted for the BMX Park. She stated that residents voted most strongly for Bluebird Gap Farm, Gosnold's Hope, the aquatics facility, and for activity buses. She stated that she believes the aquatics facility supporters were residents, such as parents of swimmers and high school coaches. She noted that if Council is looking at the potential for Regional visitors to a new attraction, it is important to note what the visitors say, not just residents.

Ms. McCormick stated that the results have been given to the Capital Budget Review Committee. Their recommendation is due to the City Manager by March with the proposed CIP budget from the City Manager due to Council by April 15th.

PRESENTED by Brian Gordineer, City Assessor; Gloria Washington, Budget Director; and Robin McCormick, Communications Strategist.

REGIONAL ISSUES

NEW BUSINESS

Councilman Tuck noted that there was a retreat planned for February 5th. He stated that he met with the City Manager to determine what would be covered and why it was being done, and she did an admirable job in her explanation. He stated that he would like to know more about the retreat, why it was planned and the expected outcome. He noted that there will be an outside facilitator and asked how much that cost will be.

Ms. Bunting stated that she would try to restate what was shared with Councilman Tuck previously. Councilman Tuck stated that he preferred to hear from the rest of Council because she was directed by them to hold this retreat.

Mayor Wallace asked if Councilman Tuck was not satisfied by the explanation given by the City Manager. Councilman Tuck stated that he was not. Mayor Wallace asked exactly what Councilman Tuck was looking for. Councilman Tuck asked what the agenda would be, what Council is trying to accomplish, and what the cost of the outside facilitator would be. Ms. Bunting stated that she could provide the cost. She noted that the agenda will be structured by the outside facilitators based upon conversations with each Councilmember. She noted that Ms. Donna Hodges, Senior Executive Assistant, has been working with each Councilmember to schedule the appointments. She stated

there is a team of three facilitators, with a facilitation background and local government background. She stated that she does not have the exact figure, but it is approximately \$6,000. This includes the work done with Council in advance to prepare the retreat, as well as the actual retreat and follow-up reports. The preliminary guidance given to the facilitators is that, with a new Council, there is an opportunity to look differently at procedures and policies, such as Public Comment. Rather than doing things without full Council consensus and conversation, those issues should be worked through. The work will also include strategic visioning and identifying how Council will proceed so that staff will not put something in the budget, thinking that there was clear direction when there was not, or some on Council believing something was decided with others thinking it has not been decided. This will allow a clear facilitated direction, both for Council and for staff, particularly as the budget process begins. She stated that this will be helpful from a staff perspective, and Council has also informed her it would be helpful for them.

Mayor Wallace stated that he agreed with the City Manager.

Councilman Tuck asked what the Council would be looking at strategically when the recommended budget will not be presented to Council until after the retreat. The retreat will take place on February 5th and budget presentations will begin on February 12th. He stated that the procedures being followed now, with respect to Public Comment, may have been changed from how Council proceeded in the past. He stated that there was a public meeting previously where Council discussed appointing individuals to come up with a plan for how Council would conduct Public Comment. He stated that he has not received any feedback to date. He stated that if this was to be discussed, he believes a public presentation should be made on what the group recommends before a meeting to discuss that takes place. He stated that he believes that should be a public discussion. Ms. Bunting clarified that the retreat is a public meeting. She also noted that strategic visioning and priorities were held last year at the same time, during the December/January timeframe. She stated that earlier today was a good demonstration on how different Councilmembers perceive things at different stages and how staff perceives things at different stages. As an administrator, she stated that she sees value in there being clarity on the priorities of Council as the budget process begins, so that as decisions are made, staff can reflect Council's priorities as best as possible. She stated that staff gives Council data such as CIP input, but Council is elected to represent their best wisdom. Even if Councilmembers are unsure about what specific project they wish to fund, having clarity about the vision that would guide the budget process is very important. As an example, if Council wants Hampton to be the amateur sports complex of Hampton Roads, this would drive decision-making in a certain direction. If Council wants Hampton to be the status quo, this would drive decision-making in a different direction. If there is no sense of clarity from Council, what will drive the recommendations for the budget will be staff opinion and public input. This retreat will allow Council to direct staff based on personal reflections and community engagement. She stated this could be done in a different way, but there seemed to be a consensus that this was the best way for Council to provide clarity, and having a seasoned facilitator team would help.

Mayor Wallace stated that the operative word that the City Manager used was team. He stated that one of the things that will hopefully be an outcome of this process is understanding how each member of Council processes information and how priorities are established so that Council becomes a better and more integrated team. He stated that the second aspect would be how the chair conducts the meeting, such as reading

materials versus the Clerk of Council reading materials. He stated that these are the types of items that would be discussed in the retreat. Councilwoman Snead stated that Mayor Wallace and Ms. Bunting had said what she wanted to say.

Councilman Tuck noted that last year, the retreat took place six months into a new Council. Now, there is only four months before there are up to five new members of Council. He stated that the teambuilding idea seemed interesting. While he desires to have a team, at this point, Council would be discussing strategic planning, but hasn't fully implemented some of the plans already put into place. Now, Council will plan again and in four months, there will be new Councilmembers who will be proposing new plans, and a whole new team. He stated that he finds the timing of it interesting. Mayor Wallace stated that it takes six months for new members to decide what issues they need to pursue, so it would be twelve months before there is a rational justification for subsequent retreats.

Councilwoman Snead stated that in her particular case, even though she is very familiar with the operations of the City from the perspective of staff, from the perspective of a Councilmember, it has taken her at least a year to get to the point where she's comfortable with her input. She emphasized that Council is a team and she needs to know how each member processes information so that she can have a better understanding of the way decisions are made. She stated that this is crucial. She stated that Council is made up of human beings and it's about relationships. If Council is going to be an effective leader of the City, it needs to come together as a team and have a vision for the City. She stated that many of her constituents say, "I really don't feel as if the Council is on one accord or has agreed to a certain vision." She stated that Council can't keep waiting for elections to occur in order to move forward. She stated that vision may need to be adjusted later, but this Council needs to do its work now, and this is part of it.

Councilman Moffett stated that he agrees with the things that have already been said. He stated that he believes it's important for Council to have a clear vision, not only for other members of Council, but so the citizens will be able to support the vision as well. He stated that there will always be change, and Council will not always agree, but each member can understand where the mark is and march in the direction of success for Hampton. He stated that he wished Council had the opportunity to meet more, because it would move faster if members understood each other better. He stated that he was thankful for the City Manager planning this and he agrees that an outside facilitator is a good thing who can keep Council on track. He stated that he is fully supportive of the idea. He stated that it is about continuous learning.

Councilman Tuck referenced the buffer at Willow Oaks, an agreement that was made between the City and an organization and the City took back responsibility for that area. He asked if there were other contracts that the City has with private entities that have resulted in the City now performing those responsibilities. Ms. Bunting stated that she was not aware of any, but she will survey all the departments and check with the City Attorney's Office. She stated that this agreement went back many years and it is possible that there could be things that predate many of the current staff.

Councilman Moffett stated that he would like to continue to build relationships with the Veteran and military community. He noted that passions can run high on certain subjects. He stated that some Veterans have contacted him regarding a response from a

recent article by the Salvation Army official who indicated that he did not believe that Councilmembers were genuinely concerned. He stated that he is a Councilmember and he is one of the Veterans mentioned in the article. He stated he wanted to reassure not only the gentleman who made the comment, but the Veteran community, that not only he, but the entire Council stands firmly in support of the City's Veterans. He stated that he believes it is important that rather than throw stones back and forth, they work together. He stated that staff should look into additional outreach to find what expectations are there that can be fulfilled or ask the Mayor and City Manager to meet with the Salvation Army official who has questioned the City's commitment. He stated that he believes in the Salvation Army, who are good people doing good things. He stated that the City is willing to go anywhere to reaffirm the commitment to being a Veteran friendly community. He stated that he would like a report on where the City is on outreach to the party who made the comment.

Mayor Wallace stated that the City had reached out to the Veteran community through the Military Affairs Committee (MAC), and he had made an extensive presentation in terms of where the City's values were, and received very positive feedback from the military community on the initiatives the City was taking to find alternatives that met the Salvation Army's needs. He stated that it was ironic that all this took place, and then the article was published.

Ms. Bunting stated that she received a media inquiry last week about the fact that the Salvation Army was currently looking on the Southside. This was the first she had heard of that. She directed Mr. Bruce Sturk, Director of Federal Facilities Support, who has been the City's liaison with the Salvation Army, as well as the military community generally, to make inquiries about this news. He received feedback that the Salvation Army had been approached by a group on the Southside to ask if they were limited to the Peninsula. Her understanding was that the site she had reported on previously, the apartment complex, was still the preferred site and they were waiting on the waiver from the VA, but in an abundance of caution, they were looking at all options. Having read the article, she asked Mr. Sturk to look into what more the City could do to show its commitment. The Major who had made the comments was not available that day. Mr. Sturk did speak with the gentleman who runs the Salvation Army program, who stated that they were still interested in the apartment complex. She noted that this is not a local decision; it is a Washington, DC decision. She has not heard back from the gentleman running the program or the Major about a specific thing they think the City is not doing. She stated that she liked the idea that perhaps the Mayor and Vice Mayor could visit these gentlemen with her. She stated that Mr. Mike Yaskowsky, Business Development Manager, sits on the advisory board and made inquiries to make sure they felt the City was doing everything it could, and received affirmative statements that there was not a concern at the larger advisory board. She stated that she has not personally talked with the Major because he has been out of his office, but she hopes to have a better report after speaking with him. She emphasized that the City staff is more than willing to work with the Salvation Army with any site they are interested in. Some of the sites have been excluded because the private property owners have had other plans and the City cannot control the private marketplace. She stated that the City cannot control the VA waiver process either. Mayor Wallace emphasized that the City has been 100% cooperative with the Salvation Army and that the reason it had not made additional progress was not because of something that the City was doing, but because of the waiver process at the VA.

Ms. Bunting stated that she believes the Southside inquiry was unsolicited, and she believes it is worthwhile to look at all available options. She noted that they have never restricted their view to Hampton exclusively. The program started on the VA campus, and the Federal government decided that they could no longer accommodate them on campus. This is why the City began actively working with the Salvation Army to find a suitable site. In the earlier days, they looked at Newport News and other Peninsula locations. She stated that the City does not take offense at them looking at other places or if they find a better deal financially elsewhere. She stated that they are welcome in Hampton and the City will do whatever it can to expedite consideration in the areas that it controls locally. She emphasized that the current holdup is because of a decision that must be made in Washington, DC.

Councilman Stuart stated that he recently noticed an editorial entitled "Virginia Air & Space Center on the Upswing." He stated that the quote he noticed was about the leadership making shrewd, if difficult, decisions. He stated that he wanted to call attention to the fact that the City Manager's Office has loaned Mr. Brian DeProfio, Special Projects Manager, to the Air & Space Center and he has done a stellar job. He stated that it was a wonderful editorial and he hopes all of Hampton reads it. He thanked Mr. DeProfio, staff, and the Virginia Air & Space Center Board.

CLOSED MEETING

6. 14-0067 Closed session pursuant to Virginia Code Sections 2.2-3711.A.3 to discuss or consider the disposition of publicly held real property in the Coliseum Central area, where discussion in an open meeting would adversely affect the bargaining position or negotiating strategy of the City.

Ms. Bunting stated that she has confirmed with the Economic Development Director that given the time constraints on Council, the item originally scheduled for closed session can be postponed.

COUNCIL didn't convene a closed session and will consider this item at a later date.

ADJOURNMENT

George E. Wallace
Mayor

Katherine K. Glass, CMC
Clerk of Council

Date approved by Council _____